

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed June 27, 2003. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Specification Amendments

Various amendments have been made to the specification through this response to correct typographical and/or grammatical errors. Although these amendments effect changes to the specification, it is respectfully asserted that no new matter has been added.

II. Claim Objections

Claim 4 has been objected to for omission of the word "be". In view of this objection, claim 4 has been amended to include the word "be". It is respectfully submitted that, due to that amendment, claim 4 is not objectionable.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

A. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-17, and 19-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yonezawa (U.S. Pat. No. 6,271,805).

The rejection states that Yonezawa discloses Applicant's invention as recited in the above-identified claims. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

B. The Yonezawa Reference

Yonezawa discloses a monitoring (i.e. surveillance) system through which video data captured by various cameras can be delivered to one or more monitoring terminals by a video transmission terminal. As described by Yonezawa:

The video transmission terminal of this embodiment is used together with a video camera as an image signal generator. The terminal receives a video camera control signal from a monitoring terminal serving as a video reception terminal, and actually controls the video camera With the above arrangement, a video can be transmitted to a monitoring terminal in a remote place through a network 100, and camera control can also be performed upon reception of a camera control signal from the monitoring terminal.

Yonezawa, column 3, lines 1-8 and 58-61.

Nowhere does Yonezawa discuss transmission of graphics to an electrical device such as that disclosed by Applicant for the purpose of displaying the graphics in a control panel of the device.

C. Discussion of the Rejection

It is axiomatic that “[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of *each element* of the claim under consideration.” W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983)(emphasis added). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In the present case, several features of Applicant's claimed inventions are not disclosed in the Yonezawa reference. The reason for this is simple: Yonezawa discloses a video surveillance system, *not* a system that facilitates the display of graphics on an electrical device control panel. In the following, Applicant discusses the shortcomings of the Yonezawa reference in regard to various limitations of Applicant's claims.

In regard to independent claim 1, Yonezawa fails to disclose or suggest "receiving from a user a selection of graphical data representing a graphic to be transmitted to the electrical device" as is recited in that claim. Contrary to that alleged in the Office Action, columns 3 and 5 of Yonezawa do not discuss a user *selecting* graphical data. Instead, Yonezawa only discloses a user manipulating a graphical user interface. Therefore, Yonezawa further does not disclose a selection that is pertinent to graphical data that is to be *transmitted* to the electrical device.

In further regard to claim 1, Yonezawa also fails to disclose or suggest "facilitating transmission of the graphical data representing the graphic to the electrical device such that the electrical device can display the graphic in a device control panel" as is recited in claim 1. As a first matter, Yonezawa does not disclose any *transmission of graphical data*. As noted above, Yonezawa only discloses transmission of captured video, and user manipulation of a graphical user interface. Furthermore, Yonezawa does not disclose a transmission that enables the electrical device to display the graphic in a "device control panel". Again, the Yonezawa system is a surveillance system in which captured video is transmitted to a monitoring terminal, not a display contained in a control panel of an electrical device of the type disclosed by Applicant. Applicant notes that ample support for the control panel is provided by Figure 1 and the various text that describes the electrical device embodiments.

Regarding claim 4, Yonezawa does not disclose or suggest “transmitting the graphical data along with a job to be performed by the electrical device” as recited in that claim. Again, Yonezawa only discloses transmitting video data to a monitoring terminal. No “job” is ever sent to the monitoring terminal.

Regarding claim 6, Yonezawa does not disclose or suggest “receiving an indication of when the graphic is to be displayed” as recited in that claim. Once again, Yonezawa does not disclose transmitting a graphic to an electrical device. It logically follows that Yonezawa similarly does not disclose receiving an indication as to when to display the transmitted graphic. For similar reasons, Yonezawa does not disclose “receiving an indication of an electrical device state during which the graphic is to be displayed” as recited in claim 7 or an electrical device state that comprises at least one of “an initialization state, a ready state, an operating state, and a power save state” as recited in claim 8.

With respect to independent claim 9, Yonezawa fails to disclose or suggest “means for *receiving from a user a section of graphical data representing a graphic to be transmitted to the electrical device*” or “means for facilitating *transmission of the graphical data* representing the graphic to the electrical device *such that the electrical device can display the graphic in a device control panel*” for reasons discussed in relation to independent claim 1.

Regarding claim 11, Yonezawa fails to disclose or suggest “means for facilitating transmission of the graphical data along with a job to be performed by the electrical device” for reasons discussed in relation to claim 4.

Regarding claim 13, Yonezawa fails to disclose or suggest “means for receiving indication of an electrical device state during which the graphic is to be displayed” for reasons discussed in relation to claim 7.

In regard to independent claim 14, Yonezawa fails to disclose or suggest “*receiving graphical data* that has been selected by a user”, “*receiving an indication as to how a graphic* represented by the selected graphical data *is to be displayed*”, or “displaying the graphic *in a device control panel* according to the received indication” for reasons discussed in relation to claims 1 and 6.

Regarding claim 15, Yonezawa does not disclose or suggest “receiving the graphical data along with a job to be performed by the electrical device” for reasons discussed in relation to claim 4.

Regarding claim 16, Yonezawa does not disclose or suggest “receiving an indication of an electrical device state during which the graphic is to be displayed” for reasons discussed in relation to claim 7. For similar reasons, Yonezawa does not disclose or suggest an electrical device state that comprises at least one of “an initiation state, a ready state, an operating state, and a power save state” as recited in claim 17.

With respect to independent claim 19, Yonezawa fails to disclose or suggest “means for *receiving graphical data* that has been selected by a user”, “means for *receiving an indication as to how a graphic* represented by the selected data *is to be displayed*”, or “means for displaying the graphic *in a device control panel* according to the received indication” for reasons discussed in relation to claims 1 and 6.

Regarding claim 20, Yonezawa does not disclose or suggest “means for receiving the graphical data along with a job to be performed by the electrical device” for reasons discussed in relation to claim 4.

Regarding claim 21, Yonezawa does not disclose or suggest “means for receiving an indication of an electrical device state during which the graphic is to be displayed” for reasons discussed in relation to claim 7.

Due to these clear deficiencies of the Yonezawa reference, Applicant respectfully asserts that Yonezawa does not anticipate any of Applicant's claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 5, 12, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonezawa in view of Gabler et al. ("Gabler," U.S. Pat. No. 6,300,959).

The rejection alleges that Yonezawa discloses Applicant's invention substantially as claimed with the exception of displaying two or more frames in sequence. The rejection concludes, however, that in view of the Gabler disclosure, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to display two or more frames in sequence in the Yonezawa system. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

B. Discussion of the Rejection

As identified above in reference to independent claim 1, Yonezawa does not teach many of the explicit features of Applicant's claims. In that Gabler does not remedy the deficiencies of the Yonezawa reference, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 12, and 18, which depend from claims 1, 9, and 14, respectively, are allowable over the Yonezawa/Gabler combination for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 9, and 14 are allowable over Yonezawa.


V. New Claims

As identified above, claims 22-33 have been added into the application through this response. Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims describe an invention novel and unobvious in view of the prior art of record and, therefore, respectfully requests that these claims be held to be allowable.


CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-33 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


David R. Risley
Registration No. 39,345

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on

9-28-03

Signature